UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,964	09/04/2002	Henry Thomas Ubik	201-1007 FAM	7009
28549 7590 05/07/2007 ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C. 28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD, SUITE 250			EXAMINER	
			LANEAU, RONALD (
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	,,
		•	····	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/064,964	UBIK ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Ronald Laneau	3714		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY SHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as is not stime may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Fe This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	•		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrave Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the oregin of the drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the legance.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	• .				
Attachment	(s)				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ' No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite		

Response to Amendment

1. The response filed on 02/16/07 has been entered. Claims 1-7 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al (US 2003/0163233 A1) in view of Heinrich et al (US 2002/0044058 A1).

As per claims 1 and 6, Song discloses a method for inventory management of a plurality of transportation vehicles wherein each vehicle has an active RF transmitter in communication with a diagnostic service bus on said vehicle (page 1, [0011] – [0012]), said method comprising the steps of: defining a service area for active transmission between said RF transmitter and a server specific to said service area; communicating data relevant to said transportation vehicle from said transmitter to said server automatically and in real time (se abstract); and determining an inventory of transportation vehicles within said predefined service area. Song does not explicitly disclose an inventory of transportation vehicles within a predefined service area but Heinrich discloses an inventory of vehicle within a predefined service area being close to the RFID transponder to collect data from the vehicle as claimed with the predefined service area being the location of the vehicle (page 1, [0006], pages 1-2, [0015], lines 1-7).

Art Unit: 3714

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the system of inventory vehicles as taught by Heinrich into the system of Song because it would provide a savings in both time and labor to be able to audit the inventory automatically without the need for physically checking every vehicle.

As per claims 2-4 and 7, the system taught by Song is capable of indicating the step of communicating a time said vehicle entered said predefined service area to said Server; the step of communicating a time said vehicle left said predefined service area to said Server; and both the steps of: communicating a time said vehicle entered said predefined service area to said server; and communicating a time said vehicle left said predefined service area to said Server as claimed (see fig. 6).

As per claim 5, the system of Song would also determine a location of a predetermined number of vehicles having predetermined characteristics, including a destination site; and delivering said predetermined number of vehicles to said destination site due to its tracking system.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/16/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Song fails to disclose "defining a service area." In response to Applicant's arguments, Although Song's vehicle is sometimes in motion but there comes a point of time where this vehicle is park and once parked, it becomes easier to define a service area for that particular vehicle. Furthermore, the newly added reference (Heinrich) is used to disclose

Art Unit: 3714

that the concept of defining a service area using an RFID tag is well known in the art. The collection of data disclosed by the Heinrich reference can be used by the Song's system to determine the inventory item of that particular vehicle. Both references deal with collecting data from a vehicle and therefore are in the same field of endeavor. Claims 1-7 are finally rejected.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 3:00.

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Ronald Laneau **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 3714

5/1/07